Admissibility Algebra: A Policy-Relative Foundation for Identity, Invariance, and Certified Transformation

Douglas C. Youvan doug@youvan.com www.youvan.ai July 5, 2026

We introduce Admissibility Algebra as a policy-relative algebra of identity under transformation. Category theory formalizes structure by morphism; homotopy type theory formalizes identity by path. Both presuppose, explicitly or implicitly, a prior decision: which transformations are licensed to count as identity-preserving. Admissibility Algebra makes this decision primitive. Its basic data are presentations Ω, transformations T, policies Π, admissibility selectors Adm, invariants Inv, certificates Cert, and coherence laws Coh. The primitive identity judgment is not X = Y but X ≡π Y, meaning that X and Y are identical under policy π by an admissible, invariant-preserving, certified transformation. Objects are therefore not bare presentations but policy-objects Xπ equipped with orbit, stabilizer, invariant, certificate, and coherence structure. Classical equality, isomorphism, gauge equivalence, topological equivalence, biological continuity, personal identity, and metaphysical persistence become special cases of policy-relative identity. The resulting framework extends Cat/HoTT by algebraizing the jurisdiction under which arrows, paths, and equivalences acquire identity force.

Keywords: Admissibility Algebra, identity policy, policy-relative identity, invariant-preserving transformation, certified identity, category theory, homotopy type theory, univalence, gauge equivalence, personal identity, metaphysics of identity, abstract algebra.

1. Introduction

Category theory begins after a selection of morphisms. Homotopy type theory begins after a determination of identity paths. In both cases a deeper question is already active: which transformations are allowed to count as identity-preserving?

Let Ω be a universe of presentations. A presentation may be a term, diagram, field, state, organism, person-stage, theory, or world-description. Let T be a universe of possible transformations. A transformation t→Y need not preserve identity. It is merely a candidate transition.

Admissibility Algebra adds a third primitive: a policy π ∈ Π. A policy specifies which transformations are admissible, which invariants must be preserved, and which certificates establish identity. Thus identity is not primitive equality but certified policy-relative equivalence.

The primitive judgment is:

$X \equiv_\pi Y$

read: X and Y are identical under admissibility policy π.

The thesis is:

Objecthood = presentation + admissibility policy + invariant + certificate + coherence.

Hence the bare presentation X is not yet the object. The object is X_π, the presentation X under identity policy π.

1.1 Problem

Ordinary equality suppresses jurisdiction. It does not state whether sameness is syntactic, algebraic, topological, gauge-theoretic, biological, legal, personal, or metaphysical. Yet each identity regime preserves different invariants and admits different transformations.

A rotated square may be the same square geometrically but not pixelwise. A gauge-transformed field may be the same physical state but not the same mathematical expression. An adult may be the same organism as the child but not the same molecular aggregate. A copied mind may be functionally equivalent but not personally continuous.

Thus equality without policy is underdetermined.

1.2 Aim

The aim is to define an algebra whose objects are identity policies and whose induced structures govern policy-relative objecthood.

Admissibility Algebra is not a replacement for Cat/HoTT. It is a prior regulatory layer. It decides when arrows become admissible arrows, when paths become identity paths, and when equivalences become identity-certifying equivalences.

2. Basic Data

An admissibility system is a tuple:

$A = (\Omega, T, \Pi, Adm, Inv, Cert, Coh)$

where:

Ω is a universe of presentations.

T is a universe of transformations.

Π is a universe of admissibility policies.

Adm assigns to each π a class $\mathrm{Adm}\pi \subseteq T$ of admissible transformations.

Inv assigns to each π an invariant structure $\mathrm{Inv}\pi$.

Cert assigns to each π and pair X,Y a witness space $\mathrm{Cert}\pi(X,Y)$.

Coh assigns higher coherence conditions among certificates.

Definition 2.1

A presentation is any entity $X \in \Omega$ prior to policy-relative object formation.

Definition 2.2

A transformation is any candidate map, process, deformation, rewrite, evolution, encoding, gluing, or transition $t \to Y$.

Definition 2.3

A policy π is a structured admissibility rule determining:

1. admissible transformations,
2. protected invariants,
3. valid certificates,
4. coherence constraints.

Definition 2.4

A certificate $c \in \mathrm{Cert}\pi(X,Y)$ is a witness that X and Y are identical under π.

Thus:

$X \equiv\pi Y \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{Cert}\pi(X,Y)$ is inhabited.

3. Policy-Objects

A policy-object is not a bare X. It is X under π.

Definition 3.1

For $X \in \Omega$ and $\pi \in \Pi$, define the policy-object:

$X\pi = (X, \pi, \mathrm{Orb}\pi(X), \mathrm{Stab}\pi(X), \mathrm{Inv}\pi(X), \mathrm{Cert}\pi, \mathrm{Coh}\pi)$.

Here $\mathrm{Orb}\pi(X)$ is the π-orbit of X, $\mathrm{Stab}\pi(X)$ is the π-stabilizer of X, $\mathrm{Inv}\pi(X)$ is the protected invariant, $\mathrm{Cert}\pi$ is the certificate system, and $\mathrm{Coh}\pi$ is the higher coherence structure.

Definition 3.2

The π-orbit of X is:

$\mathrm{Orb}_\pi(X) = \{Y \in \Omega : X \equiv_\pi Y\}$.

It is the identity cloud of X under π.

Definition 3.3

The π-stabilizer of X is:

$\mathrm{Stab}_\pi(X) = \{t \in \mathrm{Adm}_\pi : t \to X \text{ and } t \text{ preserves } \mathrm{Inv}_\pi(X)\}$.

It is the self-preserving transformation structure of X under π.

Proposition 3.4

The same presentation may determine non-identical policy-objects under distinct policies.

Proof sketch

Let π be pixel-exact identity and ρ be topological identity. A drawing X has trivial or near-trivial orbit under π but a large deformation orbit under ρ. Hence X_π and X_ρ have distinct orbit, stabilizer, invariant, and certificate structures. Therefore $X_\pi \neq X_\rho$ as policy-objects.

Corollary 3.5

Objecthood is policy-relative.

4. Equality and Policy-Relative Identity

Classical equality is recovered only as a special policy.

Let π_{disc} be the discrete policy admitting only exact self-identity. Then:

$X \equiv_{\pi_{\mathrm{disc}}} Y \Leftrightarrow$ X and Y are strictly identical presentations.

Let π_{iso} be an isomorphism policy. Then:

$X \equiv_{\pi_{\mathrm{iso}}} Y \Leftrightarrow$ X and Y are isomorphic by an admissible isomorphism.

Let π_{gauge} be a gauge policy. Then:

$X \equiv_{\pi_{\mathrm{gauge}}} Y \Leftrightarrow$ X and Y are gauge-equivalent physical presentations.

Thus equality is not abolished. It is indexed.

Axiom 4.1 Reflexivity

For every valid policy π and presentation X:

$X \equiv_\pi X$.

Equivalently, $id_X \in Adm_\pi$ when π is an identity policy.

Axiom 4.2 Invariant Preservation

If $X \equiv_\pi Y$, then $Inv_\pi(X)$ is transported to $Inv_\pi(Y)$ by a π-admissible certificate.

Axiom 4.3 Scoped Substitution

If $X \equiv_\pi Y$, then X and Y are substitutable only in contexts respecting Inv_π.

Remark 4.4

Substitution is not global. Topological identity permits topological substitution, not metric substitution. Gauge identity permits observable substitution, not gauge-dependent substitution. Personal identity permits moral or legal substitution only under policies preserving those invariants.

5. Algebra of Policies

Policies form algebraic objects.

Definition 5.1 Policy refinement

$\pi \leq \rho$ means π is stricter than ρ.

Formally:

$\pi \leq \rho \Leftrightarrow$ for all X,Y, $X \equiv_\pi Y$ implies $X \equiv_\rho Y$.

Thus every π-identity is a ρ-identity, but not conversely.

Definition 5.2 Policy meet

$\pi \wedge \rho$ is the policy admitting only transformations admissible under both π and ρ, with combined invariant and certificate requirements.

Thus:

$Adm_{\pi \wedge \rho} = Adm_\pi \cap Adm_\rho$, subject to coherence.

Meet tightens identity.

Definition 5.3 Policy join

$\pi \vee \rho$ is the least coherent policy admitting transformations from π or ρ, closed under the required composition rules.

Join broadens identity.

Warning 5.4

Unrestricted join may collapse identity. If $\pi \vee \rho$ admits all transformations and preserves no invariant, $\Omega/(\pi \vee \rho)$ becomes indiscrete.

Definition 5.5 Policy quotient

When π generates an equivalence relation, the quotient Ω/π is the set or higher structure of π-equivalence classes.

If π is directed, irreversible, partial, or higher-dimensional, Ω/π must be replaced by a category, preorder, filtration, groupoid, or higher groupoid.

Proposition 5.6

Policy refinement reverses orbit size.

If $\pi \leq \rho$, then $\mathrm{Orb}_\pi(X) \subseteq \mathrm{Orb}_\rho(X)$.

Proof sketch

Every π-certificate is also a ρ-certificate. Hence every π-equivalent presentation is ρ-equivalent.

6. Certificates and Coherence

Identity requires witness.

Definition 6.1

$\mathrm{Cert}_\pi(X,Y)$ is the witness object for $X \equiv_\pi Y$.

It may be a set, type, category, groupoid, proof space, process trace, physical transformation, lineage, memory-continuity witness, or metaphysical certificate, depending on π.

Definition 6.2

A certificate $c \in \mathrm{Cert}_\pi(X,Y)$ consists minimally of:

1. a transformation $t \to Y$,
2. proof $t \in \mathrm{Adm}_\pi$,
3. preservation of Inv_π,
4. satisfaction of Coh_π.

Definition 6.3

If $c,d \in \mathrm{Cert}_\pi(X,Y)$, a second-order certificate $h \Rightarrow d$ witnesses coherence between identity proofs.

Higher certificates continue this tower.

Axiom 6.4 Coherence

If identity witnesses compose, their composites must agree up to admissible higher witness whenever the policy requires path-independence.

Remark 6.5

Some policies preserve path-dependence. Historical, biological, personal, and thermodynamic identities may require distinct paths to remain distinct. Coherence does not always collapse paths; it regulates when path differences matter.

Proposition 6.6

Identity certification may fail by:

1. absence of admissible transformation,
2. invariant failure,
3. missing witness,
4. incoherent witnesses,
5. overbroad collapse,
6. threshold violation,
7. branching contradiction.

7. Relation to Category Theory

A category may be regarded as an admissibility-shaped arena.

For a policy π, if Adm_π contains identities and is closed under composition, one obtains a category C_π with:

$\mathrm{Obj}(C_\pi)$ = π-admissible presentations,

$\mathrm{Hom}_{C_\pi}(X,Y) = \mathrm{Adm}_\pi(X,Y)$.

Thus categorical morphisms are admissible transformations.

Proposition 7.1

Categories are generated after admissibility.

Proof sketch

The category of groups admits homomorphisms rather than arbitrary functions. The category of topological spaces admits continuous maps rather than arbitrary maps. The category of vector spaces admits linear maps rather than arbitrary functions. Each categorical hom-class is produced by a structure-preservation policy.

Definition 7.2

A functor $F_\pi \to D_\rho$ is policy-preserving if every π-admissible arrow maps to a ρ-admissible arrow.

Thus functors transport admissibility.

Definition 7.3

A natural transformation $\eta \Rightarrow G$ is a coherent comparison of policy-preserving translations.

It certifies that two functorial transports of identity are compatible with admissible arrows.

Remark 7.4

Category theory studies morphism-structured worlds. Admissibility Algebra studies the policies by which morphisms become identity-relevant.

8. Relation to Homotopy Type Theory

HoTT internalizes equality as path. Admissibility Algebra policy-indexes which paths count.

Definition 8.1

For a type-like presentation A and terms x,y, define a policy-indexed identity type:

$Id_{\pi,A}(x,y)$

the type of π-admissible identity witnesses from x to y.

Definition 8.2

A policy-indexed path space is:

$Path_\pi(X,Y) = Cert_\pi(X,Y)$.

This is the space of admissible paths from X to Y.

Definition 8.3 Admissible univalence

For a policy π:

$X \simeq_\pi Y \Rightarrow X \equiv_\pi Y$.

Equivalence induces identity only when equivalence is admissible under π.

Remark 8.4

Univalence is not weakened. Its jurisdiction is made explicit. Not all equivalences license all identities.

Proposition 8.5

HoTT supplies the geometry of identity. Admissibility Algebra supplies the jurisdiction of identity.

Proof sketch

HoTT treats identity proofs as paths and higher paths. Admissibility Algebra determines which paths and higher paths are admitted as identity witnesses under a policy.

9. Physical Applications

Physics distinguishes representational transformation from physical transformation.

Gauge transformations, coordinate transformations, phase changes, basis changes, and observer-frame transitions are identity-preserving only under policies that declare them physically redundant or equivalent.

Definition 9.1 Gauge identity

For field presentations A,A′:

$A \equiv_{\pi\text{gauge}} A'$

iff there exists an admissible gauge transformation certifying preservation of gauge-invariant structure.

The physical state is $\text{Orb}_{\pi\text{gauge}}(A)$, not A alone.

Definition 9.2 Coordinate identity

For coordinate presentations X,X′:

$X \equiv_{\pi\text{coord}} X'$

iff X and X′ preserve the invariant geometric or physical structure under admissible coordinate transformation.

Definition 9.3 Observer-relative identity

For observer-indexed quantum descriptions XO and YO′:

XO ≡πobs YO′

iff there exists an admissible observer-transition certificate gluing the descriptions coherently.

Proposition 9.4

A physical law is an invariant over an admissibility orbit.

Proof sketch

A law is physically meaningful only insofar as its content survives transformations declared representational, redundant, or symmetry-preserving by the theory.

Remark 9.5

Dualities in physics are high-level certificates between theory presentations. A duality asserts that two apparently different theories belong to one policy orbit, relative to a specified invariant.

10. Biological, Cognitive, and Personal Identity

Living systems persist by regulated change. Therefore biological identity is not material fixity but admissible continuity.

Definition 10.1 Organismal policy

πorg admits transformations preserving living organization, lineage, metabolism, development, repair, and homeostatic integration.

Thus embryo, child, adult, and aged organism may belong to one Orbπorg(X), despite molecular non-identity.

Definition 10.2 Molecular policy

πmol admits only transformations preserving specified molecular identity.

πmol is stricter than πorg in some respects, but it fails to capture living continuity.

Proposition 10.3

Organismal identity is not reducible to molecular identity.

Proof sketch

An organism persists through molecular turnover. Therefore X ≡πorg Y may hold while X ≠πmol Y.

Definition 10.4 Cognitive policy

πcog admits transformations preserving memory integration, agency, self-modeling, embodied perspective, and functional continuity within specified bounds.

Definition 10.5 Personal policy

πperson is a composite high-level policy involving organismal, cognitive, narrative, social, legal, moral, and possible metaphysical invariants.

Schematic form:

πperson ≈ πorg ∧ πcog ∧ πnarr ∧ πsocial ∧ πmoral, with context-dependent legal and metaphysical extensions.

Remark 10.6

Personal identity is not a single equality. It is a layered admissibility algebra.

Proposition 10.7

Copying does not entail personal identity unless the copying transformation is admissible under πperson.

Proof sketch

A functional duplicate may preserve some informational invariants while failing embodied, historical, moral, or first-person continuity. Therefore functional equivalence alone is insufficient unless πperson explicitly admits it.

11. Metaphysical Extensions

Metaphysical identity concerns persistence under radical transformation: death, resurrection, transfiguration, soul-continuity, divine recognition, world-renewal, or meaning-preservation.

Admissibility Algebra does not assert such identities. It states their formal burden.

Definition 11.1 Soul-policy

πsoul is a proposed policy under which a soul-invariant preserves personal identity across transformations that may defeat material, biological, or psychological policies.

Definition 11.2 Resurrection policy

πres is a proposed policy such that:

Pdeath ≡πres Praise

where Pdeath is the person at death and Praise is the resurrected person.

A valid πres must specify:

1. admissible transformation across death,
2. preserved person-invariant,
3. non-branching or branching rule,
4. certificate of continuity,
5. relation to embodiment.

Proposition 11.3

Resemblance is not resurrection identity.

Proof sketch

A replica may preserve features without preserving a certified identity path. Resurrection identity requires a πres-certificate connecting the deceased and raised person.

Definition 11.4 Meaning-bearing world

A world W is meaning-bearing under policy πmeaning if persons, promises, sufferings, responsibilities, redemptions, and histories are connected by admissible identity paths preserving narrative and moral invariants.

Proposition 11.5

Meaning requires certified continuity.

Proof sketch

If the sufferer and the redeemed subject are not connected by an admissible identity path, redemption does not preserve the original subject. If the promiser and fulfiller are not connected, promise collapses. Meaning-bearing history requires continuity of relevant identity invariants.

12. General Theory of Admissible Being

The general ontology is:

Being = admissible invariant-preserving certified transformation.

A thing is not merely what it is at an instant. It is what remains itself under the transformations proper to it.

Theorem 12.1 Seed Theorem

Given Ω and policies $\pi,\rho \in \Pi$, the same presentation $X \in \Omega$ may generate distinct policy-objects $X\pi$ and $X\rho$. Therefore objecthood is not determined by presentation alone.

Proof

Let π and ρ have distinct admissibility selectors or invariant structures. Then $Orb\pi(X)$, $Stab\pi(X)$, $Inv\pi(X)$, or $Cert\pi$ differs from the corresponding ρ-structure. Hence $X\pi$ and $X\rho$ are distinct policy-objects. Therefore presentation alone is insufficient for objecthood.

Corollary 12.2

The world admits multiple legitimate object inventories, each generated by a policy.

Corollary 12.3

A stricter policy preserves more distinctions; a looser policy forgets distinctions.

Corollary 12.4

Emergence is policy-relative object formation across scale.

A macroscopic object is generated when a higher-level policy quotients lower-level presentations while preserving higher-level invariants.

Definition 12.5 Admissible realism

Admissible realism is the doctrine that objects are real as invariant-bearing structures under lawful identity policies.

It rejects both rigid atomism and arbitrary constructivism.

Final Thesis

To know a being is to know its admissible transformations.

Admissibility Algebra is the algebra of how things are allowed to remain themselves.

13. References

1. Mac Lane, S. Categories for the Working Mathematician. 2nd ed. Springer, 1998.
2. Awodey, S. Category Theory. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 2010.
3. Riehl, E. Category Theory in Context. Dover Publications, 2016.
4. Leinster, T. Basic Category Theory. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
5. Baez, J. C., and Dolan, J. Higher-Dimensional Algebra and Topological Quantum Field Theory. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 36, 6073–6105, 1995.
6. Bénabou, J. Introduction to Bicategories. Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 47, Springer, 1967.
7. Grothendieck, A. Revêtements étales et groupe fondamental. Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1960–1961, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 224, Springer, 1971.
8. Brown, R. Topology and Groupoids. BookSurge, 2006.
9. Hatcher, A. Algebraic Topology. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
10. HoTT Book Authors. Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics. Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
11. Martin-Löf, P. Intuitionistic Type Theory. Bibliopolis, 1984.
12. Hofmann, M., and Streicher, T. The Groupoid Interpretation of Type Theory. Twenty-Five Years of Constructive Type Theory, Oxford University Press, 1998.
13. Awodey, S., and Warren, M. A. Homotopy Theoretic Models of Identity Types. Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, 146, 45–55, 2009.
14. Kapulkin, C., Lumsdaine, P. L., and Voevodsky, V. The Simplicial Model of Univalent Foundations. arXiv preprint, 2012.
15. Voevodsky, V. Univalent Foundations Project. Institute for Advanced Study, 2010–2014.
16. Noether, E. Invariante Variationsprobleme. Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse, 235–257, 1918.
17. Weyl, H. Space, Time, Matter. Dover Publications, 1952.
18. Yang, C. N., and Mills, R. L. Conservation of Isotopic Spin and Isotopic Gauge Invariance. Physical Review, 96, 191–195, 1954.

19. Utiyama, R. Invariant Theoretical Interpretation of Interaction. Physical Review, 101, 1597–1607, 1956.

20. Atiyah, M. F. Geometry of Yang-Mills Fields. Scuola Normale Superiore, 1979.

21. Baez, J. C., and Muniain, J. P. Gauge Fields, Knots and Gravity. World Scientific, 1994.

22. Rovelli, C. Relational Quantum Mechanics. International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 35, 1637–1678, 1996.

23. Everett, H. Relative State Formulation of Quantum Mechanics. Reviews of Modern Physics, 29, 454–462, 1957.

24. Zurek, W. H. Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical. Reviews of Modern Physics, 75, 715–775, 2003.

25. Wigner, E. P. Remarks on the Mind-Body Question. In The Scientist Speculates, edited by I. J. Good, Heinemann, 1961.

26. Maturana, H. R., and Varela, F. J. Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living. D. Reidel, 1980.

27. Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., and Rosch, E. The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience. MIT Press, 1991.

28. Jonas, H. The Phenomenon of Life: Toward a Philosophical Biology. Northwestern University Press, 2001.

29. Hull, D. L. Individuality and Selection. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 11, 311–332, 1980.

30. Mayr, E. The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution, and Inheritance. Harvard University Press, 1982.

31. Locke, J. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. 2nd ed., 1694.

32. Parfit, D. Reasons and Persons. Oxford University Press, 1984.

33. Shoemaker, S. Self-Knowledge and Self-Identity. Cornell University Press, 1963.

34. Olson, E. T. The Human Animal: Personal Identity without Psychology. Oxford University Press, 1997.

35. Ricoeur, P. Oneself as Another. University of Chicago Press, 1992.

36. Schechtman, M. The Constitution of Selves. Cornell University Press, 1996.

37. Quine, W. V. O. Ontological Relativity and Other Essays. Columbia University Press, 1969.

38. Lewis, D. On the Plurality of Worlds. Blackwell, 1986.

39. van Inwagen, P. Material Beings. Cornell University Press, 1990.

40. van Inwagen, P. The Possibility of Resurrection. International Journal for Philosophy of Religion, 9, 114–121, 1978.

41. Swinburne, R. The Evolution of the Soul. Revised ed. Oxford University Press, 1997.

42. Hick, J. Death and Eternal Life. Harper and Row, 1976.

43. Whitehead, A. N. Process and Reality. Corrected ed. Free Press, 1978.

44. Ladyman, J., Ross, D., Spurrett, D., and Collier, J. Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized. Oxford University Press, 2007.

45. French, S. The Structure of the World: Metaphysics and Representation. Oxford University Press, 2014.

46. Youvan, D. C. Reality as Equivalence: Univalent Relational Dynamics, Category Theory, Homotopy Type Theory, and an Equivalence-First Foundation for Mathematical Physics. ResearchGate preprint, 2026.

47. Youvan, D. C. Wigner's Friend as a Gluing Problem: Category Theory, Homotopy Type Theory, and the Relational Structure of Quantum Reality. ResearchGate preprint, 2026.

48. Youvan, D. C. A Categorical-HoTT Formalization of Wigner's Friend as Contextual Gluing. ResearchGate preprint, 2026.

49. Youvan, D. C. Quantum Reference Frames as Contextual Gluing: A Categorical-HoTT Formalization of Gauge, Observer, and Frame Equivalence. ResearchGate preprint, 2026.

50. Youvan, D. C. Admissibility Algebra: Identity Policies, Invariant-Preserving Transformation, and a New Abstract Algebra Above Category Theory and Homotopy Type Theory. ResearchGate preprint, 2026.

The author has published over 5,600 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.